REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-22 are pending in the application. Claims 11-22 are allowed. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected. Claims 3-10 are objected to. Claims 15 and 21 were previously withdrawn without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations previously recited in now-cancelled dependent claim 8. Claims 9 and 10 have been amended to correct claim dependencies resulting from the amendment to claim 1 and the cancellation of claim 8. Claim 8 has been cancelled. No new matter has been added.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3-10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter.

Applicants also thank the Examiner for the indication that claims 11-22 are allowable.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Dixon (U.S. Pat. No. 5,515,506).

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 8, which was objected to by the Examiner as being dependent upon a rejected based claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, the § 102(b) rejection to claim 1 is believed to be moot.

Claim 2 depends from allowable amended claim 1, and for at least this reason, the § 102

rejection of claim 2 is believed to be moot. Claim 2 recites the error detection component comprises an error detection state machine (EDSM) to output a next-entry-to read-out signal and a parity bit signal. Dixon does not disclose the use of a state machine as part of its parity encoding and decoding system. Rather, the parity logic tree of Dixon is a hierarchy of exclusive-OR (XOR) gates designed to compare N bits and output a single bit. Furthermore, the parity system of Dixon does not output a next-entry-to read-out signal that identifies the next entry in a processor resource to read for error detection purposes. Dixon lacks any disclosure as to how data read from a cache is identified for reading and error detection. Absent such a disclosure, claim 2 cannot be anticipated by Dixon under § 102(b). For at least this reason as well, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection of claim 2.

Request for Allowance

It is believed that this Amendment places the application in condition for allowance, and early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees, or credit any overpayments, to Deposit Account No. **11-0600**.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON LLP

Dated: January 9, 2008

By: /Mark D. Yuan/
Mark D. Yuan
(Reg. No. 57,312)
Attorneys for Intel Corporation

KENYON & KENYON LLP
333 West San Carlos St., Suite 600
San Jose, CA 95110

Telephone: (408) 975-7500
Facsimile: (408) 975-7501